

THOUGHTS ON LINGUISTIC STATES

PART III SOLUTION

CHAPTER VI THE DIVISION OF THE NORTH

The problem having been realised we must now search for a solution.

The solution lies obviously in adopting some standard for determining the size of a State. It is not easy to fix such a standard. If two crores of population be adopted as a standard measure most of the Southern States will become mixed States. The enlargement of the Southern States to meet the menace of the Northern States is therefore impossible. The only remedy is to break up the Northern States of U.P., Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.

How did this solution not strike the Congress Working Committee I am unable to understand. It is so obvious.

Division of the Northern States

As I have said the Commission in designing linguistic States has created a consolidation of the North and balkanisation of the South. The Commission has not I am sure done this intentionally. But intentionally or unintentionally the fact is there. Its evil consequences are also clear.

It is therefore necessary that this situation must be rectified. The only way to do this is to divide the three States of (1) Uttar Pradesh, (2) Bihar and (3) Madhya Pradesh into smaller units. In this behalf I make bold to offer certain tentative proposals.

This division does not conflict with the underlying principles of a linguistic State. For, if these States are divided in the way suggested, each resulting State will be a linguistic State.

I am happy to find Mr. Pant saying in the recent debate in Parliament on the subject that he has no objection to the cutting up of the U.P. What he said for U.P. may well be taken as applicable to Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.

Division of Uttar Pradesh.—My proposal with regard to the Uttar Pradesh is to divide it into three States (See Map 2). Each of these three States should have a population of approximately two crores which should be regarded as the standard size of population for a State to administer effectively. Where the boundary lines of these three States should be drawn I have shown in the accompanying Map No. 2.

The three States of the Uttar Pradesh could have as their capitals

(2) Meerut (2) Cawnpore and (3) Allahabad. They are situated quite in the

centre of each of these three States.

Division of Bihar—My proposal with regard to Bihar is to divide it into two States (See Map 3). Each of these two States will have a population of a little over one and half crores. It is not a small population for one Government to administer.

Where the boundary lines should be drawn I have shown in the accompanying Map No. 3.

The two States of Bihar could have as their capitals (1) Patna and (2) Ranchi. They are situated quite in the centre of the two States.

Division of Madhya Pradesh.—Madhya Pradesh stands before us in two forms. The old Madhya Pradesh and the new Madhya Pradesh.

The old Madhya Pradesh consisted of :

- (1) the Province at one time known as C. P. and Berar, and
- (2) some Indian States out of the States known as the Eastern States.

This old State of Madhya Pradesh had a population of 2 1/2 crores. It consisted of 22 districts. Its legislature had 223 members.

The new Madhya Pradesh as planned by the Commission will consist of:

- (1) the 14 districts of the old Madhya Pradesh,
- (2) the whole of Bhopal,
- (3) the whole of Vindhya Pradesh,
- (4) Madhya Bharat except : Sunel enclave of Mandasaur district, and
- (5) the Sironj sub-division of Kola district of Rajasthan.

The total population of this new Madhya Pradesh will be 26.1 million and its area will be about 171,200 square miles.

I suggest that it should be divided into two States : (1) Northern Madhya Pradesh, (2) Southern Madhya Pradesh (See Map 4).

The State of New Madhya Pradesh should consist of the following areas :

- (1) The whole of Vindhya Pradesh.
- (2) The whole State of Bhopal.

The State of Southern Madhya Pradesh should consist of—

- (1) the whole State of Indore, and
- (2) the 14 districts of Mahakosal.

The population of this Indore State will be about 2 crores and the population of this Vindhya Pradesh will be about 1.30 crores. (See Map No. 4).

Why the Commission created this monster State it is no way to know. Even Prime Minister Nehru was surprised at its creation.

All that one can think of is that the Commission has been under the impression that one language, one State is a categorical imperative from which there is no escape. As I have shown one language, one State can never be categorical imperative. In fact one State, one language should be the rule. And

therefore people forming one language can divide themselves into many States.

CHAPTER VII THE PROBLEMS OF MAHARASHTRA

I

THE PROPOSALS TO DEAL WITH MAHARASHTRA

Maharashtra is another area which is a subject of controversy. There are four proposals in the field :

(1) To retain the Bombay State as it is i.e. to retain it as a mixed State consisting of Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay.

(2) To disrupt the existing State and to separate Maharashtra and Gujarat and make them into two separate States.

(3) To make united Maharashtra with Bombay as one State.

(4) To separate Bombay from Maharashtra and make it a separate City State.

I would like to state what my proposals are. They are as follows : Bombay as a mixed State should be done away with. I would divide Maharashtra into four States (See Map 5) : (1) Maharashtra City State (Bombay), (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra and (4) Eastern Maharashtra.

Maharashtra City State— The City of Bombay *plus* such area of Maharashtra as would enable it to be a good and strong City State.

Western Maharashtra— (1) Thana, (2) Kolaba, (3) Ratnagiri, (4) Poona, (5) North Satara, (6) South Satara, (7) Kolhapur and (8) the Marathi-speaking territories given over to Karnataka.

Central Maharashtra—(1) Dang, (2) East Khandesh, (3) West Khandesh, (4) Nasik, (5) Ahmednagar, (6) Aurangabad, (7) Nanded, (8) Parbhani, (9) Beed, (10) Usmanabad, (11) Sholapur City and the Marathi-speaking area of Sholapur District and (12) the Marathi-speaking territories given over to Telangana.

Eastern Maharashtra.—(1) Buldhana, (2) Yeotmal, (3) Akola, (4) Arnraoti, (5) Wardha, (6) Chanda, (7) Nagpur, (8) Bhandara and (9) the Marathi-speaking territories given to Hindi States.

I will next proceed to examine the merits of these proposals.

II

MAHARASHTRIANS UNDER THE MIXED STATE

Should Bombay remain a mixed State ? It is a most unusual procedure. The City of Calcutta is not a separate City State. Madras is not a separate City State. Why Bombay alone be made the exception ?

Secondly, it is already a mixed State. What is the experience of the Maharashtrians under this mixed State ? The Maharashtrians have suffered terribly under this mixed State. What is the position of the Maharashtrians in the

Bombay Cabinet ?

Let us consider the distribution of Ministership :

Gujarathi Ministers	4
Marathi Ministers	4
Kannada Ministers	1
Total	9

Gujarathi members in the Assembly are only 106, Marathi members are 149 and yet the number of Gujarathi Ministers is equal to that of Maharashtra Ministers.

Let us come to Deputy Ministers :

Marathi speaking	5
Gujarathi speaking	2
Kannada speaking	2
Total ...	9

Only among Deputy Ministers do the Maharashtra have a majority of one.

But how the power and subjects are distributed among the Ministers and Deputy Ministers is the most important matter. It shows what power and authority the Maharashtra Ministers possess in this mixed Cabinet of the Bombay State.

Allocation of Subjects among Ministers

	Gujarathi Ministers			Maharashtrian Ministers		
1	Morarji Desai	105	subs	Hirey	49	subs
2	Dinkerrao Desai	26	subs	Nimbalkar	20	subs
3	Jivaraj Mehta	43	subs	Tapase	15	subs
4	Shantilal Shah	28	subs	Chavan	4	subs

The allocation of subjects among Deputy Ministers is also done on the same pattern.

Allocation of Subjects among Deputy Ministers

Allocation of Subjects among Ministers

	Gujarathi Deputy Ministers			Maharashtrian Deputy Ministers		
1	Indumati Sheth	12	subs	Wandrekar	12	subs
2	Babubhai J Patel	3	subs	Deshmukh	4	subs
				Naravane	5	subs
				Sathe	5	subs
				Faki	3	subs

Let us now consider how much money is spent on development in Maharashtra and in Gujarat. The following figures will give an idea of the Per Capita Expenditure for the three years on Maharashtra and Gujarat :

Per Capita Expenditure on Development in Rupees				
		Years		
	Population	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53
Maharashtra	21720091	1.7	2.3	1.8
Gujarath	11896789	2.9	3.1	3.2

What a differential treatment ? What a discrimination ? What an injustice ? Can anybody blame the Maharashtrians if they felt disputed with the mixed State of Bombay ?

Such a position of subordination no Maharashtrian can tolerate. The idea of a mixed State must be blown off once for all.

III

THE POSITION OF THE CITY OF BOMBAY

The Bombay City is an area which is a subject matter of controversy. The controversy has become very acute.

Maharashtrians want the City to be part of Maharashtra. Gujarathis want the City to be a separate State. Heads have been broken over the controversy. But there has been no agreement. It is therefore necessary to go to the root of the matter.

The Gujarathis do not claim Bombay City as their own. But will not let go their hold on it. They claim a sort of easement over it by reason of the fact that they control the trade and industry of the City. The issue is: should it become part of Maharashtra or should it be constituted into a separate State ? The Gujarathis and Maharashtrians are sharply divided on the issue. The Maharashtrians want that Bombay should become exclusively a part of the new Maharashtra State. The Gujarathis are stoutly opposed to it. They have presented two alternatives. One alternative is not to break up the existing bi-lingual State of Bombay into two linguistic units of Gujarath and Maharashtra. The Congress Working Committee's decision is to make the city of Bombay into a separate State.

The Gujarathis are happy. The Maharashtrians are naturally angry. The resentment of the Maharashtrians is well justified. The arguments urged against the claim of the Maharashtrians have no force at all.

The first argument that is urged is that the Marathi-speaking population of Bombay City does not form a majority of the total population of the City. The total population of Bombay City is very large (See Statistical Appendix). Marathi-speaking population is 48 per cent.

Those who use this kind of argument do not seem to realise the weakness of it.

The total Marathi population of Bombay City is no doubt less than 50 per cent.

but it has to be valued against two factors. One is that geographically no one can deny that Bombay is part of Maharashtra even if the Maharashtrians are in a minority in the City. Even Mr. Morarji Desai admitted in the course of his speech in the meeting of the Gujarath Pradesh Congress Committee that Bombay is part of Maharashtra.

The second point to be taken into consideration in valuing the population factor is the continued influx of population from the rest of India who come to Bombay either for making profits or for earning their bread. None of them regard Bombay as their home; they should not therefore be counted as permanent residents of Bombay City. Many come for a few months and go back.

Bombay is a home only to the Maharashtrians and none else. It is not therefore logical or fair to count the non-Maharashtrians for the purpose of coming to the conclusion as to who form the majority of population in the Bombay City.

Again it is not realised that the increase in the non-Marathi-speaking people in the Bombay City is due to the absence of a local law restricting citizenship. If Bombay State had such a law all this influx into Bombay from all parts of India could have been shut out and the Maharashtrian majority retained.

It is also not realised that the influx of the non-Maharashtrians in Bombay is due to the fact that Bombay is a port, and it is a port on the Western Coast. The route from Europe to Bombay is much shorter than the route from Europe to Calcutta or Europe to Madras. That is why large number of poor people from other parts of India leave their homes and come to Bombay as temporary residents. It is easier to find a job in Bombay than elsewhere.

Really speaking the matter has to be looked at from a different point of view. People have been coming to Bombay for the last two hundred years or so. Yet this influx has not reduced the Maharashtrian population in the city below 48 per cent. After two hundred years, the bedrock of its population remains Maharashtrian in its composition. This is due to the migratory character of City (See Appendix 3). The Gujarathis are migratory population.

There are also other arguments which could be urged in favour of allowing Bombay to remain as part of Maharashtra.

Bombay is not the only composite city in India. Calcutta and Madras are also composite cities. If Calcutta can be part of Western Bengal and Madras can be part of Madras State what objection can there be to Bombay being made part of Maharashtra ? This is the question that every Maharashtrian will ask. I see no answer to this question. The only answer that comes to one's mind is that the Congress High Command thinks that Maharashtrians are unfit to rule others. This is a slur on the Maharashtrian character and they will not tolerate it.

It is said that Bombay has been built up by the capital belonging to non-Maharashtrians. That may be so. But has Madras been built by the capital of Madrasedes ? Has Calcutta been built by the capital of Bengalees ? Without the capital of Europeans Madras and Calcutta would have been villages. Then why urge this point against the Maharashtrians when they claim Bombay to themselves ? Maharashtrians have at least contributed labour without which Bombay could not have been what it is. It must always be remembered that the life lines of Bombay lie in Maharashtra. The sources of its electricity lie in Maharashtra. Sources of its water supply lie in Maharashtra. The sources of its labour lie in Maharashtra. Maharashtra can at any time make the city of Bombay ' *Mohenjodaro* ' a City of the Dead.

The Gujarathi population is filled with fear that Maharashtrians will practise discrimination against them. But under our Constitution discrimination is not possible for the reason that the Constitution contains a list of fundamental rights and remedies by way of writs from the High Court and the Supreme Court which can immediately provide redress for a wrong. For every wrong of a discriminative character there is a remedy provided by the Constitution. Why should the Gujarathis have any fear ?

Let us now consider what benefit the Gujarathis are going to get from Bombay being made a separate City State. Their population in the Bombay State is only ten per cent. How many seats can they get in the Bombay City State Legislature? Not even ten per cent. How can ten per cent protect their clients against 90 per cent ?

It must be remembered that the feelings between the Maharashtrians and the Gujarathis would hereafter be running high as never before. A Maharashtrian will not vote for a Gujarathi candidate and a Gujarathi voter will not vote for a Maharashtrian candidate. Hitherto the Gujarathis have been able to plough the sands of Maharashtra with their money. But money may not succeed once self-respect is aroused. The Gujarathis must consider whether goodwill is not a better protection than a paltry share in the Government of the City.

While the case of Maharashtra is as strong as steel there are some points on the other side which they must not fail to consider in their anger.

They want Bombay to be within Maharashtra. But the question which they must consider is: What do they want ? Do they want prosperous Bombay or do they want decadent Bombay ? Can Bombay be prosperous under Maharashtra ? This in other words means : can Maharashtra provide the capital necessary for the growing trade and industry of the City ? No Maharashtrian can answer this question in the affirmative. The Maharashtrians may be able to supply the need for capital after a course of years. But certainly not now.

The second point is : what would be the effect on the standard of living of

Maharashtrians living in Bombay if the City's prosperity declines either by flight of capital or removal of business houses. The Maharashtrians must not forget, however it may hurt their pride, that they are a nation of clerks and coolies. What employment can they get in a declining city ?

The Maharashtrian should consider the question of Bombay from this point of view. There is a saying which says :

There is also another reason why Bombay City should be made a separate state. The minorities and the Scheduled Castes who are living in the village are constantly subjected to tyranny, oppression, and even murders by the members of the majority communities. The minorities need an asylum, a place of refuge where they can be free from the tyranny of the majority. If there was a United Maharashtra with Bombay included in it where they can go to for safety ? The same tyranny was practised over the Brahmins, Marwaris and Gujarathis living in the villages when Godse killed Mr. Gandhi. All the Brahmins, Marwaris and Gujarathis who were once living in villages ran away and are now living in towns and forgetting their experiences are shouting for United Maharashtra, after having reached a safe harbour.

It seems to me that Maharashtrians will do well to accept the decision of the Congress High Command for the time being.

The Maharashtrians need have no fear of losing Bombay. Nobody can dispossess Maharashtrians of Bombay. Much less can there be any ouster of them by anybody.

The real objection to the creation of Bombay as a separate State arises from the fact that the name Bombay does not carry within it the sense that it is part of Maharashtra. It is to remove this objection that I propose that the new State of Bombay should be renamed by another name which will carry on its face the word Maharashtra.

Supposing in terms of this suggestion instead of saying that Bombay be made a separate State it is said that Maharashtra be divided into four States, (1) Maharashtra City State (which is Bombay City), (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra, (4) Eastern Maharashtra; what objection can there be to the creation of a separate State of Bombay ?

This also involves the separation of Bombay. With this change in the name of the City I like to know which Maharashtrian can raise objection to the creation of Bombay as a separate City State on the ground that this scheme separates Bombay from Maharashtra ? To say that Bombay be made a separate State is merely stating that Maharashtra be divided into four States. If there is no objection to Maharashtra being divided into *two* or *three* States what objection can there be to Maharashtra being divided into four? I can see none. For the sake of similarity in language I propose that Calcutta be called Bengal City

State and Madras be called Tamil City State.

This is one proposal which I make to ease the tension between Maharashtrians and Gujarathis.

The Maharashtra City State will be a surplus State. Those who are wanting United Maharashtra with Bombay are hoping to get the benefit of this surplus for Maharashtra.

The surplus revenue of the City State arises because of (1) The Property Tax and (2) The Electricity Tax. Can the revenue from these two sources be appropriated by Maharashtra if Bombay becomes a separate City State ?

Nothing can be done to take away the yield of the Property Tax from the Bombay City State Property Tax. It is a local tax, on local situated property. The State within which the property is situated is entitled to the yield of the Tax.

With regard to the Electricity Tax the situation is different.

When Gujarath and Maharashtra are separated—and they must be—Gujarath will claim the revenue derived from electricity produced and consumed within Gujarath. Maharashtra will claim the revenue derived from electricity produced and consumed within Maharashtra. Bombay City as a State will do the same. Can Bombay be allowed to do so and appropriate the revenue to itself ? Is it just ? Bombay City does not produce electricity. It is produced outside Bombay City in Maharashtra. Therefore the new Bombay City State has no right to appropriate to itself the whole revenue derived from electricity. The proper thing to do is to apply the principle of the segregation of the sources and division of the yield well known to all students of State Finance.

To put it in concrete shape let the Centre take over the taxation of Electricity and divide the yield among the four States of Maharashtra— (1) Bombay, (2) Western Maharashtra, (3) Central Maharashtra, (4) Eastern Maharashtra according to their needs. It will also ease the financial strain that the three Maharashtras are likely to suffer on account of the separation of Bombay.

IV

UNITED OR DIVIDED ?

I have said that Bombay be given a new area and made into a separate City State.

There now remains the question of how to deal with the rest of the Maharashtra. I have suggested that the rest of the Maharashtra should be divided into three States.

From very ancient times Maharashtra has been divided into three States.

Maharashtra first comes to be known in history during the time of Ashok. It is mentioned in *Mahavansa* in connection with reference to the missionaries sent by Ashok to different parts of India for the purpose of propagating Buddhism. But thereafter the Pali literature speaks of *Trai Maharashtra* or three

Maharashtras. It means that from very ancient times there have been three Maharashtras. My proposal is not therefore new.

The distribution of population, area and revenue would be as shown in Table (on page 160).

The accompanying map No. 5 will show the area and boundaries of each of the three divisions.

For the present, from the point of view of area and population there is nothing to complain against the three divisions.

From the earliest times they have always been spoken of as *Trai Maharashtras*.

The division does no wrong to the language principle. In fact if all the three Maharashtras have the same language it can help to develop the Marathi language if it is worth their while to do so.

The question of viability I will consider later on. I propose to deal with it separately in a special chapter.

Bombay was then unknown. Otherwise it would have been the fourth part of Maharashtra.

Of the remaining three parts what I call Eastern Maharashtra is already a separate State. All that required is that it should be allowed to remain separate. It has got a well-established administration system, a well-established revenue system and a well-established judicial system. It has been separated from the trammels of the Hindi-speaking people.

The only problem that remains is how to divide the area covered by the Maharashtra which is part of the present Bombay State and the Marathwada of the Hyderabad State.

Instead of forming a merger of the two into one and joining it to the third which I call Eastern Maharashtra, why not divide the Maharashtra part of Bombay and Marathwada into two equal States ? This is my scheme. I transfer six districts of Maharashtra part of the Bombay State and make them part of Marathwada. (See Map No. 5). The distribution of the area and population of the three Maharashtras are shown below :

The Population Area and Revenue of the Three Maharashtra States will be approximately as follows:

Name of State	Total Population of the territory	Area in square miles	Total Revenue	Total expenditure
Western Maharashtra	12677316	30028	262420441	not known
Central Maharashtra	12409044	55482	216380095	not known
Eastern Maharashtra	8027130	39004	94111012	not known

Total	33113490	124514	572911548	not known
-------	----------	--------	-----------	-----------

I will now proceed to state my reasons in support of my plan.

I have said that Maharashtra has always been divided into three. This is a historical argument. It at least shows that the tradition, the way of life and the social and economic condition of what is called United Maharashtra is not one. Those who are in a hurry to have United Maharashtra may not take it seriously. But there are other arguments which arise out of the present condition and which cannot be ignored. I mention a few.

My first argument is that a single Government cannot administer such a huge State as United Maharashtra.

The total population of the Marathi-speaking area is 3,30,83,490. The total area occupied by the Marathi-speaking people is 1,74,514 sq. miles. It is a vast area and it is impossible to have efficient administration by a single State. Maharashtrians who talk about Samyukta Maharashtra have no conception of the vastness as to the area and population of their Maharashtra. But why there should be one single Maharashtrian State. I am quite unable to understand. To have a separate Maharashtra State is one thing. To have a single Maharashtra State is quite a different thing. I am in favour of a separate Maharashtra, separate from Gujarathis and separate from Hindi-speaking people. But I am unable to understand why a free Maharashtra should be made into one single State. The Maharashtrians are not planning to declare war on U.P. and therefore they need not have a common front.

Even from the point of view of Marathas why should there be this consolidation? What affiliation has a Maratha of Satara got with the Maratha of Aurangabad ? What affiliation has a Maratha of Nasik got with the Maratha of Ratnagiri ? What care and interest a Maratha of Satara is going to bestow upon the problems of the Maratha of Aurangabad ? What care and interest a Maratha of Nasik is going to bestow upon the problems of the Maratha of Ratnagiri ? The consolidation has no meaning and can serve no purpose.

All Maratha Ministers in the present Bombay Cabinet come from Satara District or Nasik District. There is none from Konkan.

The second consideration is the economic inequality between the three parts of Maharashtra. Marathwada has been solely neglected by the Nizam. What guarantee is there that the other two Maharashtras will look after the interests of what I call the Central Maharashtra ?

The third consideration is industrial inequality between the three parts of Maharashtra. Western Maharashtra and Eastern Maharashtra are industrially well developed. What about the Central Maharashtra ? What guarantee is there of its industrial development ? Will Western Maharashtra and Eastern Maharashtra take interest in the industrial development of Central

Maharashtra?

The fourth consideration is the inequality of education between Eastern and Western Maharashtra on the one hand and Central Maharashtra on the other. The inequality between them is marked. If the Central Maharashtra goes under the Poona University its destiny is doomed.

I am greatly worried about Marathwada. It was hitherto part of the Nizam's Territory for the last 200 years. The Nizam had criminally neglected this area. He took no interest in it. There is not a mile of canle irrigation in Marathwada. There is hardly a high school in taluka places in Marathwada. There is hardly a youth in Nizam's public service from Marathwada. I speak from knowledge and experience. People are not only down and out they are ignorant. They are being grabbed by highly advanced people on both sides. When their avenues of employment are closed there will be further degradation in their position.

I shudder to think what would happen when Marathwada goes under the Poona University. The standard of education in the schools and colleges under the Poona University is so high that hardly any boy from Marathwada can hope to pass the examination. It is quite possible that. with the madness for united Maharashtra there will develop a madness for a single and common University.

The creation of United Maharashtra will be followed by the onrush of Poona and Nagpur Brahmins in Marathwada to pick up the jobs.

There is a further reason why Maharashtra should be divided into three.

The total strength of the Bombay Legislative Assembly is 315, Out of them 149 members are Marathi-speaking. The total strength of the Bombay Legislative Council is 72; out of them 34 are Marathi-speaking. Obviously some Marathi-speaking person should have been the Chief Minister of the Bombay State. Mr. Hirey stood up as a candidate for the Chief Ministership, But he was made to sit down by the Congress High Command. Not only was Mr. Hirey made to sit down but he was forced to move that Mr. Morarji Desai be made the Chief Minister. What a humiliation for a Maharashtrian leader ! And what value does the Congress High command attach to the political intelligence of Maharashtrians ?

The same incapacity of the Maratha Ministers is clear from the division of subjects referred earlier.

It is obvious from the facts given above that the Marathas are lacking in political talent. There is no man of eminence among them such as Tilak, or Gokhale or Ranade. The Maharashtrian today counts for nothing. The Congress Maharashtrian coin is for much less in the Congress. The non-Congress Maharashtrian also counts for nothing. It is therefore absolutely essential to train up Maharashtrians in political life. This political training has become fundamental because of the transfer of power to the masses. The word

Marathas is used in two senses. In one sense it means all those who speak the Marathi language. In another sense it means all those who are Marathas by caste. They are all spoken of as Marathas. But they all fail to make the distinction between Marathas i.e. those who speak the Marathi language and Marathas i.e. those who are Marathas by caste.

Those who are going to rule Maharashtra are not Marathas by speech but Marathas by caste, notwithstanding the hopes of the Brahmins. Now it cannot be denied that Marathas are politically the most backward community. It is fundamental that they should receive political training. If there is only one Maharashtra only *one* Maratha can be trained as Chief Minister and five or six as Ministers. On the other hand if there are three Maharashtra. States, three Marathas can find training as Chief Ministers and thirty Marathas can get training as Ministers. We can do real service to ourselves by helping to educate our Masters.

The only way of educating the Marathas is to give them more field for developing their abilities and exercising their abilities. Only the creation of three Maharashtra can do this.

There is a story which is very appropriate to the occasion. The father of a young girl had taken her for an outing in a jungle. She found that under big trees there stood small shrubs. Finding this to be uniformly so, she asked her father why these small shrubs under the big trees do not grow. The father not being a botanist could not give an answer. So he said : Oh ! I do not know. He, however, felt that the question was very significant. He was a Professor in a college. Next day he went to the college and put the question to his Botanist colleague. The Botanist replied: Why! The answer is simple. The big trees use up all the sun's rays to themselves. The shrubs do not get any rays. That is why they do not grow. The Marathwada people must not forget the moral of this story.

The only argument in favour of United Maharashtra is that it is like a meeting of the two brothers Rama and Bharat in Ramayana after a long separation. It is a silly argument, not worth consideration.

There are some Maharashtrians who are satisfied with some kind of Political Treaty with Western Maharashtra guaranteeing some concessions. Treaties are like scraps of paper. They cannot be enforced. Instead of political treaties which nobody can enforce is it not better to have power in one's own hands ?

What a poor and wretched show by Maharashtrians in the Government of Bombay ! If this is the show that the most advanced and educated part of Maharashtrians can make, what can be expected from the people of Marathwada?

I advise the people of Marathwada or Central Maharashtra to have a State of

their own so that they have power in their own hands to improve their own lot.

RECLAMATION OF LOST TERRITORY

Should all the Marathi-speaking people be huddled up under one State ? Or should they be divided into two or more States.

How to dispose of the remainder when Bombay is separated is the next question. The remainder consists of two parts: (1) Gujarath, (2) Maharashtra.

I am concerned with Maharashtra.

While creating Linguistic Provinces the Commission has given over Marathi-speaking areas to non-Marathi-speaking areas. The number of such excluded areas are as follows :

1. Belgaum Taluka with the City of Belgaum.
2. Khanapur Taluka.
3. Chikori Taluka including Nipani.
4. Supa Taluka.
5. Karwar Taluka.
6. Nilanga Taluka in Bidar.
7. Ahamadpur Taluka in Bidar.
8. Udgir Taluka in Bidar.
9. Rajgir Taluka in Adilabad.
10. Some portion from Vidarbha given to the neighbouring Hindi-speaking State.

The Maharashtrians excluded from Maharashtra come to 13,89,648 in terms of population.

The Commission in retaining the mixed State of Bombay had to secure two most important objects. One is not to allow Bombay to go into the hands of Maharashtrians. This the Commission did by creating a mixed State. The second thing they had to do was to secure equality between Maharashtrians and the Gujarathis. The necessity of equality between the two In the future Legislature of the Bombay State as planned by the Commission had become urgent as the members of Karnatak in the old Assembly on whom the Gujarathis depended for their majority were to disappear in the new Karnatak State. This the Commission did by clipping the wings of Maharashtra by handing over Marathi-speaking people to non-Marathi-speaking States. There seems to be no other reason for this political vandalism.

This wrong done by the Commission to Maharashtra must now be remedied and fortunately it can be undone. The proposal of a mixed State is gone and there is no necessity for equality between Maharashtrians and Gujarathis.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY OF PRICIPLES COVERING THE ISSUE

For the sake of the reader I summarise below the principles which should underly the creation of Linguistic States which are already enunciated In the foregoing pages but which lie about scattered. These principles may be staled as below :

- (1) The idea of having a mixed State must be completely abandoned.
- (2) Every State must be an unilingual State. One State, one language.
- (3) The formula one State, one language must not be confused with the formula of one language, one State.
- (4) The formula one language, one State means that all people speaking one language should be brought under one Government irrespective of area, population and dissimilarity of conditions among the people speaking the language. This is the idea that underlies the agitation for a united Maharashtra with Bombay. This is an absurd formula and has no precedent for it. It must be abandoned. A people speaking one language may be cut up into many States as is done in other parts of the world.
- (5) Into how many States a people speaking one language should be cut up, should depend upon (1) the requirements of efficient administration, (2) the needs of the different areas, (3) the sentiments of the different areas, and (4) the proportion between the majority and minority.
- (6) As the area of the State increases the proportion of the minority to the majority decreases and the position of the minority becomes precarious and the opportunities for the majority to practise tyranny over the minority become greater. The States must therefore be small.
- (7) The minorities must be given protection to prevent the tyranny of the majority. To do this the Constitution must be amended and provisions must be made for a system on plural member constituencies (two or three) with cumulative voting.

[Contents](#)

[Part IV](#)